

## REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the Remarks submitted herewith.

Applicants' Attorney would like to thank the Examiner for discussing this application. Applicants' Attorney agrees with the substance of the Interview as described in the Interview Summary.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art figure 3 in view of Osada et al. (US 5,973,456) ("Osada"). For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996). In this case, the references do not teach or suggest all of the limitations.

Claim 1, as amended, includes the following limitation: "each of said gate signal lines is connected to said gate drive circuits at both ends of said gate signal lines." Accordingly, the claim requires that each gate signal line is connected to the gate drive circuits at both ends of each of the gate signal line. Neither prior art figure 3 nor Osada teach or suggest that limitation. While Osada teaches drive circuits on both sides, each gate signal line is only connected to either the left drive circuit or the right drive circuit. Thus, there is no teaching in Osada that a single gate line is connected to gate drivers at both ends of the gate line.

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over prior art figure 3 and Osada. Claim 2 includes all of the limitations as claim 1, and thus, claim 2 is also patentable over prior art figure 3 and Osada. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection as to claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art figure 3 in view of Peng et al. (US 6,078,142) ("Peng"). For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996). In this case, the references do not teach or suggest all of the limitations.

Claims 3-5 include all of the limitations of claim 1. As explained above, prior art figure 3 and Osada do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Moreover, Peng

does not cure the deficiencies of Osada because in Peng there is no teaching or suggestion of "each of said gate signal lines is connected to said gate drive circuits at both ends of said gate signal lines." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection as to claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Lisa A. Bongiovi

Registration No. 48,933

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone (860) 286-2929

Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 23413

May 23, 2003